



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Notes

[Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

### A REPLY TO PROFESSOR SCOTT

I have read Professor Scott's note in the *Classical Journal*, XV (1920), 239-42, and I have written a detailed reply. But second thoughts are the better, and my manuscript *nonum premetur in annum*. "Our little discussion" fits into a nutshell. Here is a table giving under each suffix, first, the words peculiar to the *Iliad*, then those found both in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey*.

	—σύνη		—ίη		—τὺς	
Croiset's <i>Iliade</i> . . . . .	6	6	21	17	5†	3
The 19 "early" books . . . . .	6	6	22*	17	4	3

\*Including one more than doubtful example.

† Presumably a mistake in counting.

Here is a dilemma: Either I am right, or the series of coincidences in this table is purely accidental.

I turn to the new matter Professor Scott has here presented. There is another error in Croiset: he cites Collitz for the formula ἦς τε μέγας τε occurring 25 times in the *Iliad* and 3 times in the *Odyssey*. By studying the *Iliad* Professor Scott has found that it contains only 8 examples of this phrase. But by his silence Professor Scott has also made himself responsible for the statement that there are 3 examples in the *Odyssey*. Anyone by studying the *Odyssey* can learn that I 508 is the only example in that poem. The ratio is the important thing. It is 8:1=24:3; Croiset says 25:3; Professor Scott implies 8:3.

Now to explain the error, for I cannot share Professor Scott's indifferentism toward causes. In spite of Professor Scott's statement: "He (Collitz) gives absolutely no statistics of any kind for the phrase ἦς τε μέγας τε," that phrase and all nine references for it are to be found on one page of Collitz' article, and on the next page the totals for the forms of ἦς—25 in the *Iliad*, 3 in the *Odyssey*. Evidently Croiset noted both sets of numbers, and haplography led to the error which Professor Scott has endeavored to correct—not very successfully.

One other passage—the last on which I shall touch—I must quote *in extenso*:

"If we take Professor Bolling's own argument that Croiset by the "Iliade" meant but 19 books, then we reach the astounding conclusion that 19 books

of the *Iliad* have 58 abstracts, and 24 books of the *Odyssey* have 81, hence the average for both poems is three and a small fraction per book, therefore they cannot belong to the same period because of their great diversity in the use of abstracts."

This is mere playing with figures through taking advantage of the equivocal afforded by the word "book," which in round numbers may mean anything from 300 to 900 lines. The 24 books of the *Odyssey* have 12,110 lines, the 19 books of the *Iliad* have 12,135 lines. The texts being equal, 57:81 is the true ratio of the usage—an increase of 42 per cent in the *Odyssey*. That is the amount of diversity made to vanish by Professor Scott's manipulation.

I declared that my former article should be purely historical, but this has drawn me one step into the merits of the question, and I find myself tempted to take one more.

This process is so closely akin to Professor Scott's method of handling his figures for the entire poem that I will note it, too. He writes, *Classical Philology*, XIV (1919), 144: "However, when we turn to Croiset we find that he gives the number for the *Iliad* as 58, and not the 39 of Causer's, and thus immediately half of the force of the argument is gone. In the article quoted above I showed that even the 58 of Croiset must be raised to 79, and, as but 81 are assigned to the *Odyssey*, the other half of the argument also vanishes."

It does vanish if you permit Professor Scott to make you forget that the *Iliad* is 3,583 lines longer than the *Odyssey*. If you keep that fact in mind, you will figure: 79 words in the 15,693 lines of the *Iliad* means an average of 50.33 words to every 10,000 lines; 81 words in the 12,110 lines of the *Odyssey* means an average of 66.88 words to every 10,000 lines. The diversity which Professor Scott thus dismisses as nothing is an increase of 32 per cent in the *Odyssey*.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

---

#### A FINAL NOTE ON CROISSET AND PROFESSOR BOLLING

It is a great satisfaction to me to find that Professor Bolling has been unable to discover any errors in my original statements that these abstracts are found in the *Iliad* seventy-eight times and not thirty-eight, and also that the phrase in question is used only eight times in the *Iliad* and not twenty-five as given by Croiset.

The only fair defense of what Croiset has written would be to show that these statements of his are true, and the only conclusive attack on me would be in showing that what I have written is false, so that I am startled to read that an error in Croiset's figures, untested by me, must be accepted as a vindication for his errors in the poem which I examined.

I simply quoted this error in regard to the *Iliad* to show the groundlessness of the sentence, "It will be, I trust, impossible to argue hereafter that Croiset